

Exhibit 27

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.
SUMNER SQUARE
1615 M STREET, N.W.
SUITE 400
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036-3215
—
(202) 326-7900
FACSIMILE:
(202) 326-7999

November 20, 2018

Via Electronic Mail

Matthew D. Provance
Mayer Brown LLP
71 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606

Re: *In re Dealer Management Systems Antitrust Litigation, MDL 2817*

Dear Matt:

I write in response to several of the proposals in your November 12, 2018 letter as well as to address the matters that were on our plate after the November 19, 2018 meet and confer.

I. CVR's RFP Responses

A. Responsive Time Period

Thank you for your offer to agree to parity in terms of the time period used for document collection. The parties are in agreement that January 1, 2013 shall be the start date for CVR's production.

B. Specific Requests

Thank you for your compromise proposals on several of the Requests. We address each in turn.

- RFP Nos. 1, 2, 10 and 11 (communications between CVR custodians and CDK/Reynolds and documents relating to access by CVR to data on CDK's and Reynolds's DMSs): As we noted in our November 1 correspondence, we believe these requests are proportionate to the needs of this case, but we are willing to wrap these requests into our negotiations regarding search terms, provided the parties can negotiate reasonable compromises on those search terms and for certain related requests that are still under negotiation.

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.

Matthew D. Provance

November 20, 2018

Page 2

- RFP No. 6 (how CVR obtains data from CDK's and Reynolds's DMSs): We are in agreement.
- RFP Nos. 17-23 (EVR providers' access to and participation in the 3PA and RCI programs): We are in agreement. To clarify, Requests 17-20 and 23 seek documents about EVR providers other than CVR, Request 21 seeks documents about MVSC, and Request 22 seeks documents about EVR providers other than CVR and MVSC.
- RFP No. 25 (checks, wires, or money transfers from CVR to CDK or Reynolds): We accept your proposal to produce documents sufficient to show the manner in which CDK is paid and the amounts that it has been paid by CVR for CVR's access to data maintained on CDK's DMS. You indicated on our November 19 meet and confer that you are also willing to produce documents sufficient to show the manner in which Reynolds is paid and the amounts that it has been paid by CVR for CVR's access to data maintained on Reynolds's DMS.
- RFP Nos. 30 and 31 (prices and fees charged to dealerships and fees remitted to state regulators): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 32 (regulatory or statutory limits on EVR fees): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 33 (communications with regulators): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 47 (CDK's or CVR's consideration or evaluation of whether to acquire EVR providers): As we discussed on our November 19 meet and confer, we believe this request is relevant to several issues in this case, including competition in state EVR markets and damages. Nevertheless, in the spirit of compromise, we are willing to limit this Request to documents relating to any consideration or evaluation by CVR of whether to purchase MVSC. Please let us know if you accept this proposal.
- RFP No. 48 (efforts to impede other EVR providers' access to Reynolds or CDK's DMSs): We are in agreement.
- RFP No. 53 (California Assembly Bill No. 516): We understand that CVR is standing on its objections to this Request. Please let us know if CVR's position has changed and if you are willing to negotiate a compromise.
- RFP No. 54 (deficiencies in CVR's product or service): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 58 (costs associated with entering a new EVR market): On our November 19 meet and confer, we proposed limiting this request to documents sufficient to show

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.

Matthew D. Provance

November 20, 2018

Page 3

analyses of the costs of entering new EVR markets, including licensing fees. Please let us know if that proposal is acceptable.

- RFP Nos. 64, 66 & 72 (communications between CVR and CDK/Reynolds): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 67 (communications between CDK and Reynolds regarding CVR): We are in agreement.
- RFP No. 68 (CVR's acquisition of AVRS): We believe that this Request is relevant to several of the issues in this litigation, including competition in the California EVR market and damages. On our November 19 meet and confer, we asked whether your compromise offer included documents sufficient to show the terms and conditions of the transaction as well as CVR's valuation of AVRS. Please let us know if that is the case.
- RFP No. 71 (communications with potential acquirers of CVR): We understand that CVR is standing on its objections to this Request. Please let us know if CVR's position has changed and if you are willing to negotiate a compromise.
- RFP Nos. 73-79 & 82 (CVR's financial and sales data): We understand that CVR intends to respond to these Requests through a production of summary-level or structured data that CVR maintains in the ordinary course of business, but that you are still following-up with your client with respect to how this data is maintained. Please let us know if CVR will not be producing documents responsive to any of these requests for any reason.
- RFP No. 84 (valuations of CVR): You did not address this Request in your November 12 letter. Please let us know whether you are willing to negotiate a compromise with respect to this Request.
- RFP No. 88 (industry publications or reports): We are in agreement.
- RFP No. 92 (contracts or agreements with dealers for EVR services): On our November 19 meet and confer, we proposed limiting this request to representative contracts with dealers in each of the markets in which CVR has operated during the relevant period. Please let us know if this proposal is acceptable.
- RFP No. 93 (communications with other EVR providers): We believe that this Request is relevant and proportionate to the needs of this case. Nevertheless, in the spirit of compromise, we are willing to propose that CVR produce communications with other EVR providers relating to: (1) MVSC (including any executive or employee of MVSC), (2) the use of independent or third-party integrators to access data on any DMS, (3) the

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.

Matthew D. Provance

November 20, 2018

Page 4

3PA or RCI programs, or (4) CDK and Reynolds. Please let us know if this proposal is acceptable.

- RFP No. 94 (RCI or 3PA programs): We believe that this Request is relevant and proportionate to the needs of the case as written. Nevertheless, in the spirit of compromise, we are willing to limit this request to documents relating to the 3PA or RCI programs *and*: (1) any other EVR provider, (2) competition in state EVR markets, or (3) CVR's ability to acquire or maintain customers in any state EVR market. Please let us know if this proposal is acceptable.
- RFP No. 95 (CVR's applications to participate in RCI or 3PA): Please confirm whether documents responsive to this Request exist or have already been produced in this litigation.
- RFP No. 96 (analysis of data access through 3PA or RCI versus other methods): We are in agreement.
- RFP No. 97 (documents referring or relating to complaints about Reynolds, RCI, CVR, CDK, or 3PA): You did not address this Request in your November 12 letter. We understand that CVR has agreed to produce complaints regarding MVSC not being a member of the 3PA or RCI programs. Please let us know if you also agree to produce complaints about Reynolds, RCI, CVR, CDK, or 3PA relating to access to data on Reynolds or CDK DMSs.
- RFP Nos. 100 and 101 (use of and payments to independent data integrators): We understand that CVR is willing to produce documents responsive to these requests that relate to AVRS's use of Authenticom (or other third party integrators) for certain DMS-related data access services. We also understand that CVR is confirming whether there are any other documents relating to CVR's (or AVRS's) use of independent integrators to access *any* DMS (including, but not limited to, CDK's and Reynolds's DMSs). Those documents would also be responsive to these Requests.
- RFP Nos. 107 & 108 (data or information CVR needs and actually obtains from CDK's or Reynolds's DMSs): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 109 (how CVR accessed DMS for each dealer to provide services): We accept your proposal.
- RFP No. 110 (CVR's competitive analyses): We are in agreement.

KELLOGG, HANSEN, TODD, FIGEL & FREDERICK, P.L.L.C.

Matthew D. Provance
November 20, 2018
Page 5

C. Market-Based Limitations

With respect to Requests 36-43 and 45, thank you for your offer to produce documents for the Wisconsin and Virginia markets in addition to the Illinois and California markets. We accept your proposal with respect to Requests 37-40. As we discussed, we propose that CVR produce documents without geographic limitation for Requests 36, 41-43, 45. We also ask that CVR do the same with respect to Request 57.

We look forward to hearing from you regarding custodians, search terms, and the other matters discussed on our meet and confer.

Very truly yours,

/s_____

Michael N. Nemelka